

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date: June 5, 2006By: Susan L. Baka
Susan L. Baka**PATENT****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Chawla et al.

APPLICATION No.: 09/901,350

FILED: July 9, 2001

FOR: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
CACHING SECURE WEB
CONTENT

EXAMINER: P. PICH

GROUP ART UNIT: 2135

CONFIRMATION No.: 5351

Amendment Transmittal

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed are:

- Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment
- Statement of Substance of Interview
- The Director is here by authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or refund any over payment to Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,
 Perkins Coie LLP



William F. Ahmann
 Registration No. 52,548


Date: June 5, 2006**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 22918
 Perkins Coie LLP
 P. O. Box 2168
 Menlo Park, CA 94026-2168
 (650) 838-4300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date: June 5, 2006

By: 
Susan L. Baka

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: CHAWLA ET AL.

APPLICATION No.: 09/901,350

FILED: JULY 9, 2001

FOR: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR CACHING
SECURE WEB CONTENT

EXAMINER: EXAMINER: P. PICH

ART UNIT: 2135

CONF. NO: 5351

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner Desir:

Please enter the following Statement of Substance of Interview.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

An Examiner telephone interview occurred on May 2, 2006. Present at the interview was William F. Ahmann (Reg. No. 52,548) – the applicant's representative. No exhibits were presented and no demonstrations of the invention were made.

On May 2, 2006, the finality of the previous Office Action was discussed. Mr. Ahmann noted that the action mailed on December 28, 2005, was incorrectly stamped Final by our office, not the USPTO and the Examiner confirmed that the Office Action was not Final.

Claims 24, 61, 64 and 67 were discussed. Next discussed was the objection to claim 61. The Examiner noted that the Office Action contained a

typographical error and should have indicated line 35 instead of line 25. Then, the 112 rejection on page 4 of the Office Action (enumerated paragraph 6) was discussed. Mr. Ahmann agreed to make the suggested amendment after the Examiner clarified that if it were to be left as is, it could be interpreted that the determining could be done by either the client or the web server also. Mr Ahmann disagreed that the claim was indefinite due to a lack of written description, but agreed to amend the claim for the sole purpose of expediting issuance of a patent in this case.

Next discussed was whether US patent 6,584,567 to Bellwood was prior art due to its date. Examiner and Mr. Ahmann decided that it did qualify as prior art due to the dates involved. Examiner and Mr. Ahmann then briefly noted that the proposed amendments sent earlier to the Examiner via email were to fix 112, second paragraph problems and incorporated the Examiner's suggestion. The Examiner then noted that claim 67 might contain a problem that the Examiner may have missed during the first Office Action. The claim recited that the first secure session and second secure session used prevent storing of static content on a reverse proxy, yet later in the claim it was recited that static content was cached/stored on the secure reverse proxy. The Examiner noted that one might interpret the secure reverse proxy as a reverse proxy and the claim seems to be contradicting itself and is missing a step to explain how the caching can be achieved to overcome the nature of the secure session protocols. Examiner and Mr. Ahmann agreed to speak once more on 5/3/2006 after we had a chance to look at the specification in more detail.

On 5/3/2006 the interview continued and the Examiner stated that the Examiner found some notes that the Examiner made the first time the Examiner looked at claim 67. The note stated that a reverse proxy and a secure reverse proxy are different. Therefore, the prevention by the first and second secure session does not apply to a secure reverse proxy. The Examiner asked Mr.

Ahmann if this was a valid interpretation and Mr. Ahmann stated that it was and also suggested another way of clarifying the claim. He suggested adding "between the client and the SRP" after "storing" in the first clause and adding "between the SRP and the web server" after "storing" in the third clause. It appeared to the Examiner that this did overcome the possible contradiction that was present in claim 67 before.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that pending claims 24, 61, 64 and 67 are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP



William F. Ahmann
Registration No. 52,548

Date:June 5, 2006

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300